



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXXV, 2.

WHOLE No. 138.

---

## I.—THE ARCHETYPE OF OUR ILIAD AND THE PAPYRI.

Ludwich estimates in his *Beiträge zur homerischen Handschriftenkunde*, *Fleckeisens Neue Jahrb.*, 27ter Supplementband (1900), pp. 31–81, that there are upwards of 300 MSS of the Homeric poems. So little has yet been accomplished in their classification that it is necessary to speak with reserve about the probability of their descent from a single archetype. Ludwich does not even discuss this problem, presumably for the reason that he does not consider it possible to settle the question at the present time. Allen—to whom we are indebted for most of what has been done in this line of investigation<sup>1</sup>—answers the question in the affirmative, cf. *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), p. 386; and Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*<sup>2</sup>, p. 42 f., is inclined to agree with him. I also regard this as the most probable explanation of the origin of our manuscripts, though I am compelled to reject the bit of evidence which Cauer adduces to support it.

This evidence is the emendation of Γ 453 in which the vulgate reading is: οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῆτί γ' ἐκέυθανον, εἴ τις ἴδοιτο for which Heyne (or perhaps Bentley) proposed ἔκευθον ἄν as a correction both of the syntax and the word-formation. If the emendation is correct, the question is indeed settled. It is impossible to believe that such a mistake was made inde-

<sup>1</sup>The publication of the evidence on which his classification of the MSS is based, is greatly to be desired. Until it is done every use made of his critical apparatus is an act of faith.

pendently in this same line by two or more scribes, and consequently we must regard our MSS as all descended from the manuscript of the copyist who made the blunder of transposing these syllables. The importance of the issue depending upon it renders the emendation unusually interesting.

Cauer of course is absolutely certain. Not only has he introduced this conjecture into a school edition (Ameis-Hentze-Cauer, Homers Ilias, Gesang 1-3, Leipzig, 1913; cf. also p. 143), but in his Grundfragen, loc. cit., he writes with unusual warmth: "Wer an einer so schlagenden, die Erklärung in sich selbst tragenden Verbesserung zweifeln mag, mit dem kann ich nicht streiten". Nevertheless, it can be shown that had *ἐκευθον ἄν* been the reading of all MSS it would have demanded emendation.

The syntax is in the first place without parallel in Homer, cf. Cauer's note "Irreale und potentiale Auffassung des Verhältnisses zwischen bedingendem und bedingtem Satze sind so nur hier bei Homer vermischt". Still more important is the fact that the position of *ἄν* is thoroughly unhomeric. \**Ἄν* placed after the verb is common enough in Attic Greek, cf. SCG., § 460, but there is not a case in Homer. The parallelism of *κέν* would be at best a weak support, as the words belong to different dialects and might easily be placed in different fashion. However, *κέν* is placed after the verb only—cf. Γ 53. 220, Δ 94, Ε 273, Ζ 285, Θ 196, Ο 697, Χ 253, Ω 56. 418, α 228, ν 237, φ 202—when the verb is the first word of its clause. This is not a mere coincidence, it is part of a much larger phenomenon, the tendency of enclitic and similar words to take the second place 'in the clause, cf. Wackernagel, IF. 1. 333 ff. Furthermore, *ἄν* and *κέν* are words behind which the Homeric poets are not inclined to allow a pause. Thus *ἄν* never stands at the close of the line, nor at the close of the 4th foot, and only 6 times—Ε 85, Ο 40, Ρ 489, Ω 566, σ 22, φ 329—before the caesura of the 3d foot. Likewise *κέν* is never used at the close of the line, rarely at the end of the 4th foot—Α 137=324, Ζ 410, Ι 57, Ξ 108, Ρ 105, Φ 280, Χ 253, Ψ 559, Ω 418, β 74, 86, γ 80, δ 644, η 33. 333, ι 131, ξ 99, ρ 514, σ 28. 166, φ 193, ψ 47, but more frequently before the caesura of the 3d foot: Α 139, Β 12=29=66, Γ 291, Δ 421, Ι 139. 409. 545, Κ 44, Λ 654, Μ 447, Ν 127, Ξ 79. 239, Ο 224, Ρ 144. 260. 622. 629,

X 130, Ψ 855, Ω 154. 183, α 236, β 168, δ 64. 421. 651, ζ 285, η 212. 314. 332, ι 334, κ 269. 383, μ 446, ο 300, π 153, σ 265, χ 66. 262. Many of these lines are exceptional only in appearance, that is the diaeresis or caesura in them is not real. To show this would lead too far from my main purpose. I will note, however, the fact that in only one passage X 253 *ἔλοιμί κεν, ἧ κεν ἀλοίην* does *κέν* stand in the fourth foot before a mark of punctuation, and it is easy to see the difference between this and the proposed: *οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῃτι γ' ἔκευθον ἄν, εἴ τις ἴδοιτο.*

In view of these facts not even the testimony of all the MSS could have made *ἔκευθον ἄν* acceptable. As for the objections to the traditional reading Cauer concedes the possibility of the syntax when he says, p. 143, "dass die Partikel *ἄν* für den Gedanken *kaum* entbehrt werden kann". I regard the sentence as the outcome of the contamination (cf. Oertel, Lectures on the Study of Language, p. 172) of two ideas: a) they were not concealing him; b) they would not have concealed him, supposing one saw him; the first clause of b) having been suppressed. Nor are we justified in demanding a form *ἐκύνθανον* after the pattern *πνύθομαι : πυνθάνομαι, φεύγω : φυγγάνω, τεύξομαι : τυγχάνω*. Presents in *-άνω* with infixed nasals are formed only in association with strong aorists, cf. Hirt, Handb.,<sup>2</sup> § 433 and the aorist *κυθεῖν* was soon lost. It is attested only γ 16, while the future *κέυσω* (12 times) guarantees a sigmatic aorist, actually used ο 263. The analogies leading to *κευθάνω* are not strong, as such verbs generally have, cf. Hirt, op. cit., § 434 a second stem in *-η*; but we may note *ἐρυκάνω, ἀλυσκάνω, ἰζάνω, ληθάνω*, and conclude that the formation of *κευθάνω* was possible, though perhaps not in good taste. The only chance for emending the passage which I can see, would be on the supposition that Sommer's theory of the admissibility of a trochee in the 4th foot was correct. We might then regard *ἐκεύθανον* as the blending of *ἔκευθον* and a gloss *ἄν*. That theory, however, seems to me<sup>1</sup> to lack sufficient proof. The objections urged against the verse are such then as to reflect upon the ability of its author; but are insufficient to impugn the credibility of the MS tradition.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. J. P. XXXIV, p. 171, n. where no countenance should have been given to Rzach's emendation of Hes. Op. 443; *κέ* being properly placed in the MSS, as Professor Wackernagel kindly points out.

The argument for a single archetype must rest for the present on a broader basis. Fragments of eight papyri (one of the *Odyssey*, the remaining seven of the *Iliad*), which were written before 150 B. C., have now been published. Of these one, P. Rylands 49, containing parts of *II* 484-9, is too small for consideration; the others all contain a text of which we can say without hesitation that it is not our Homer. Its most striking characteristic is the presence of additional lines distributed very unequally throughout the fragments. These amount to about 7% of the text, according to the computation of the last editor of such fragments, G. A. Gerhard, *Ptolemäische Homerfragmente*, p. 3, in the *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*, IV. 1, Heidelberg, 1911; while on the other hand about 2% of the verses of the vulgate are omitted in these papyri. After the year 150 B. C. the situation changes completely. Of later papyri we have more than 140; and of these only two (P. Berl. 9774 of the first century B. C. and a Florentine papyrus of the next century, cf. Cauer<sup>2</sup>, p. 48 ff.) are certainly akin to the Ptolemaic text, while of two others (P. Fayum 4, c. 100 B. C., and P. Tebt. 266 of the second century A. D.) the same may possibly be true. The others all agree in presenting what we must recognize—despite more or less variations in smaller details—as our vulgate.

This means (cf. Grenfell and Hunt's introduction to P. Hibeh 19) that an edition of Homer, substantially the same as the text offered by our mediaeval MSS appeared in Egypt shortly before 150 B. C. and succeeded almost at once in monopolizing the market. The most probable hypothesis is that all our MSS are reproductions of that edition. This probability would become a certainty if it could be shown that the text then published was a novelty for the rest of the Greek world as well as for Egypt. Personally I am inclined to believe that such may well have been the case, but the discussion of the problem requires a fuller collection of evidence than what I have now in hand. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff wrote in 1889 *Herakles*, p. 138, "ein buchhändlerisches Bedürfniss neue Homertexte zu schaffen lag auch nicht vor", but the discovery of the Ptolemaic papyri, beginning two years later, has proved on the contrary that there did take place in Egypt a revolution in the business of publishing Homer. In

the same place, Wilamowitz-Möllendorff suggested, only to reject, the idea that our vulgate was a 'kleine textausgabe' of Aristarchus, and it is possible that this may still prove to be the truth, or an approximation to it.

An interesting result of the discovery of the papyri has been the confirmation of a number of emendations. For instance, Cauer<sup>2</sup>, p. 27 ff. discusses eight passages in which a correction made to avoid neglect of the digamma is corroborated by a papyrus. Quite on a line with these is Robert's treatment of a passage in the fifth book of the Iliad, which has not received the recognition that it deserves. In our vulgate we find:

E 796 ἰδρὼς γάρ μιν ἔτειρεν ὑπὸ πλατέος τελαμώνος  
ἀσπίδος εὐκύκλου·

which in 1901, when Robert wrote, was the reading of all our authorities, except that Eustathius reported a variant ἀμφιβρότης. The passage is of cardinal importance both for the question of armor and for the analysis of the Διομήδους ἀριστεία. Robert saw that the worse attested reading ἀμφιβρότης was so superior intrinsically that it was entitled to preference. Five years later (1906) Grenfell and Hunt published a papyrus (P. Hibeh 20) which they date circa B. C. 280-240, and which contains a few letters from each line of E 796-803. In v. 797 only ]HC[ is preserved but the position of the letters renders it certain that the papyrus read ἀμφιβρότης and the editors so restored it, though apparently without realizing the importance of the variant.<sup>1</sup> At present ἀμφιβρότης is the better attested reading, though it does not yet enjoy the fascinating power which comes only from being printed in the text of an edition. And so Drerup, Das fünfte Buch der Ilias, Paderborn, 1913, p. 309, can put forward a hypothesis of a peculiar poetic technique, in virtue of which the poet treats arbitrarily the weapons of his heroes, changing or ignoring them at will; and then add a footnote: "Auch hiernach läge kein Grund vor, mit Robert, Studien zur Ilias, S. 177, die Ueberlieferung

<sup>1</sup> If anyone is inclined to brush this evidence away with the statement that the papyrus is too mutilated to prove anything, he should first note Ludwich's similar method (Homervulgata, p. 65) of dealing with Monro's restoration of Θ 216<sup>a</sup>-219, and then read in P. Hib. 21, how Monro was justified.

in v. 797 εὐκύκλον in ἀμφιβροτῆς (!) (nach Eustathios) *zu ändern*".<sup>1</sup> To defend staunchly the tradition (cf. Drerup, p. 4) has its merits; only it is well to know your tradition before you defend it.

Perhaps, however, there is something more to be learned from this footnote of Drerup's.

A marked tendency of recent Unitarian writing is its call upon reason to abdicate. That quality of a *lederndes Philologentum* is to be replaced by the simple faith that can move mountains. First a *Glaubensbekenntniss zu dem einen Dichter*, then a hypothesis that he has a peculiar poetic technique, that he operates with *souveräne Willkürlichkeit*—or some phrase tantamount thereto—and naturally all difficulties disappear. The reward promised to such believers is the revelation of a poetic beauty passing the understanding of critics.

I digress to give a specimen for which we are indebted to Drerup. In E 37–83 we have a series of battle vignettes, Drerup's treatment of which, p. 97, is well worth reading. In addition to other artistic merits he has discovered a wonderful 'kunstvolle Variation der Todesarten'. Thus we must note that of the fleeing Trojans the first is struck between the shoulders, the second in the *right* shoulder, the third in the back (the correspondence with the first vignette is made exact only by the interpolation (cf. below) of v. 57, which Drerup himself regards as possibly interpolated), the fourth is struck in the *right* buttock, the fifth in the neck, the sixth has his arm hewn off. This yields a scheme a. b. a. b. c. c, and I can only express my admiration for the ingenuity necessary to recognize it. But this is far from all. The fourth Trojan is Phereklos, the man who built for Paris the ships in which he sailed to Lacedaemon, the time of his affair with Helen. Symmetry required him to be struck on the right buttock, and the spear—naturally enough as a mere critic might imagine—passed straight on under the bone to the bladder. The scholiast, however, has a keener eye for beauty and has not allowed this splendid example of poetic justice to escape him. His comment is: κατὰ κύστιν αἰσχρὸν

<sup>1</sup> Ostern, Ueber die Bewaffnung in Homers Ilias, Tübingen, 1909, p. 15, takes a similar view; only he accuses Robert of putting ἀμφιβρότου (!) in the text.

τὸ τραῦμα τοῦ τῆς πορνείας ναπηγοῦ; and Drerup soberly adds "Dass dem Dichter solche Hintergedanken nicht fern liegen, werden wir unten beim Tode des Pandaros genauer erkennen". One hastens to p. 144, and learns that, as Pandaros had achieved his deeds of heroism with his tongue, it was consequently his tongue that was cut off by the spear of Diomedes. "Das ist die glänzendste Erfindung der 'epischen Ironie' die unserm Dichter gelungen ist". Again the scholiast has blazed the way *ἔτεμε δὲ τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐπιώρκησε (καὶ ὅτι δι' αὐτῆς ἐμεγαλύνει add. T sec.)*. Drerup's reason for dropping the first explanation (*ὅτι ἐπιώρκησε*) is, that in the breach of the truce the guilty party was Athene. May it not be that there was a more profound, a more poetic reason? I write with the greatest hesitation, *ἥδη δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὴν σοφίαν ἐπιχειρῶ μιμῆσθαι, ἅτε ἐπιθυμῶν αὐτῆς*. However guilty of perjury Pandaros may have been, his tongue was not the place for its punishment, for he might have pleaded: *ἡ φρὴν ὁμώμοχ' ἡ δὲ γλῶσσ' ἀνώμοτος*.

I return from my digression. The rationalistic criteria on which we have depended in the past are pronounced invalid. We can no longer reason from contradictions in the narrative; however flagrant they may be, the hypothesis of *souveräne Willkürlichkeit*, renders them of no importance. Reasoning from linguistic evidence is barred by Müllder's hypothesis, cf. f. i., Bursian's *Jahresb.*, 1912, p. 191;<sup>1</sup> reasoning from archaeological evidence is ruled out by Drerup, 'the poet changes the weapons or ignores them as he chooses'; reasoning from topographical evidence is pronounced by Rothe, *Jahresb. des phil. Vereins zu Berlin XXXVI* (1910), p. 354, inadmissible until Gruhn is convinced that Hissarlik is Troy. Gruhn, be it noted, is the man who thinks that the gods of Olympus are meant as representations of the Jews, cf. Rothe, *ibid.* XXXVIII (1912), p. 155. Reason so far as I can see has but a single refuge.

The ability *als Dichter dem Dichter nachzuempfinden* before which we are to bow down should certainly be able to distinguish between the words of the poet, and the blunders

<sup>1</sup> Müllder recognizes the existence of the problem, and he is willing to grapple with it. In these ways he differs from other Unitarians; but the practical outcome is, that, if Müllder's hypothesis were tenable, the linguistic analysis of the Iliad would be a hopeless undertaking. Müllder undertakes none.



or additions of a copyist. From this point of view Drerup fails us signally in E 797, nor does he pronounce with the necessary (cf. below) definiteness against E 42 and 57, two interpolated lines. In the single book of which he treats these are the only cases in which definite external evidence permits the testing of his power. But that he fails in these cases is all the more significant, because Drerup is philologian as well as *Nachdichter*, and in his former capacity his reason should save his faith from such pit-falls. One may object that these lines are unimportant. True in one sense—the sense in which it made no difference to theology whether the earth or the sun was the center of our planetary system.

The study of the vulgate papyri shows conclusively that a number of lines in our printed texts and manuscripts of the Iliad have been added since the year 150 B. C. The study of the Ptolemaic papyri indicates still greater fluctuations of the text. At present I shall confine my attention to the former, and we shall see that even two of these late additions have found valiant defenders. The man who interprets the Iliad as it stands without assuming either interpolation or lacuna, proves simply that his method of interpretation is unable to discriminate between Homeric and unhomeric verses.

The writers of papyri were, like other copyists, prone to error; but omissions of this sort can usually be easily detected. As such I should specify in the first place, a number of lines in which the temptation to haplography is more or less evident: A 275-6 (μήτε σὺν . . . , μήτε σύ . . . ), P. Rylands 43; B 289-90 ( . . . ἀπονέεσθαι, . . . . νέεσθαι), P. Brit. Mus. 126; B 842 (τῶν . . . , τῶν . . . ), cod. Bodl. ms. Gr. class. a 1 (P); E 75 (ἤριπε . . . , Εὐρύπυλος . . . ), Ox. Pap. 223; E 126 ἀτρομον . . . , ἀχλὺν . . . ), ibid.; Θ 59 (πᾶσαι δ' . . . , πεζοί θ' . . . ), P. Goodspeed 7; N 67 (αἶψα . . . , Αἶαν), Ox. Pap. 446; N 602-6 (Πείσανδρος δ' . . . , Πείσανδρος δὲ . . . ), P. Brit. Mus. 732; O 442 (ὠκύμοροι . . . , ὧς φάθ' . . . ), P. Berl. 230; O 551 ( . . . Τρώεσσι, . . . . τέκεσσι), ibid.; P 160-2 (αἰψά κε . . . , αἰψά κεν . . . ), ibid.; P 352-3 ( . . . μάχεσθαι, . . . μάχεσθαι), P. Berlin 9783; Ξ 141-2 ( . . . κόλπον, . . . Ὀλυμπον), P. Brit. Mus. 107; Ξ 350 ( . . . ἦνοπι χαλκῷ, . . . λίπ' ἐλαίῳ), P. Brit. Mus. 127; Ξ 459 (καὶ . . . , καὶ . . . ), P. Brit. Mus. 107; Ξ 508 (τῷ . . . , τὴν . . . ), ibid.; Ξ 537 ( . . . ἄλλον, . . .

ἄλλον), P. Brit. Mus. 127; Σ 609 (ἀντὶγα . . . , αὐτὰρ), P. Brit. Mus. 107; Φ 63 (. . . ἐρύξει, . . . ἐρύκει), P. Aberd. 7; Ω 440<sup>1</sup> (οὐκ ἂν . . . , ἧ καὶ ἀναίξας . . . ), P. Brit. Mus. 128; Ω 519-20<sup>1</sup> (. . . κατὰ θυμόν, . . . καὶ ἐσθλούς), *ibid.* No one would seriously advocate the omission from a recension of the vulgate of any of these lines, and many of them are absolutely indispensable. There are also certain external indications that their omission is accidental. Some (B 289-90, E 75, Σ 141-2, 350, 459, 508, 537, 609, Ω 519-20) are added in the same papyrus which omits them; some are found in other papyri, thus Σ 459, 508, 609, in P. Brit. Mus. 127. Only in three cases are these lines omitted by one of the MSS: N 602-6 by Mediolan. Ambros. p. sup. J 4, but added by the second hand; O 551 by the Syrian palimpsest; Σ 352-3 by Parisinus 2766. All three are clearly mere coincidences, the temptation to haplography (Πείσανδρος, Πείσανδρος; Τρώεσσι, τέκεσσι; μάχεσθαι, μάχεσθαι) being particularly strong. Finally we have the direct testimony of Didymus that P 161, Σ 537 were read by Aristarchus, and the same may be inferred for Σ 142 where Didymus mentions a reading of Zenodotus. These indications will help us in dealing with the omission of other verses.

Next come a number of lines, for the omission of which no mechanical reason can be suggested, but which are absolutely indispensable for the sense: B 549, *cod. Bodl. ms. Gr. class.* a 1 (P); Δ 215, *Cairo papyrus*, cf. Sayce, *Acad.* 1894, p. 401; Δ 461, P. Brit. Mus. 136; P 173, P. Berl. 230; Σ 132, 360, 559, 577, P. Brit. Mus. 107; T 134, *Ox. Pap.* 553; Ψ 540, P. Berl. 230; Ψ 892, P. Brit. Mus. 128. It will be noticed, as significant of the habits of their writers, that of these papyri Berl. 230, Brit. Mus. 107, figure in the preceding list. Of these lines Σ 132, 360, 577, Ψ 892 are added in the margin; Σ 132, 360 are found in P. Brit. Mus. 127, and Σ 559 in a Paris papyrus. Σ 559 is also omitted by (U<sup>d</sup>) a Breslau MS, but it is the only case of the sort. For P 173 we may infer that it was in the edition of Aristarchus, as Didymus cites the reading of Zenodotus. Σ 360 also stood in the text of Aristarchus, if he athetized 356-68, cf. Roemer, in Belzner's *Hom. Probl.* 174 n.

More doubtful, but probably accidental, are the following omissions: A 178, P. Berl. 9813, the line would be regretted

<sup>1</sup> Partly due to the distraction of beginning a new column.

and there is no evidence in corroboration of its omission; B 532, P. Tebt. 265, the line could be spared, but all other authorities have it, Didymus cites the reading of Zenodotus; Ω 119, P. Brit. Mus. 128, the line could easily be spared, but there is no other evidence against it; Ω 344, P. Brit. Mus. 114; the verse, while not indispensable, is highly desirable, there is no other evidence against it, and on the contrary readings both of Aristarchus and αἱ κοιναί are cited by Didymus. The most difficult cases are Ψ 626 (for which, cf. below), and the omission of N 46 in P. Brit. Mus. 732. The latter may easily be due (as the editors believe) to haplography (Αἶαντε . . . , Αἶαντε . . . ); it is added in the margin; it occurs in the Paris papyrus; and its omission by the first hand of (F<sup>z</sup>) a Laurentian MS is undoubtedly a mere coincidence. All this points to an accidental omission, but the meaning of the line connects it with a peculiar group of intentional omissions to be mentioned later.

As a mere blunder I should regard the addition of B 798<sup>a</sup> = Γ 185 in Ox. Pap. 20. This is the only line found in a papyrus later than 150 B. C. (excepting of course the four akin to the Ptolemaic papyri) which is foreign to our vulgate.<sup>1</sup> Its presence is due to the fact that B 798 and Γ 184 resemble each other, and that Γ 184 was, according to Aristonicus (cf. AHT. II, p. 227), cited to illustrate B 798.

The other instances of omitted lines in the papyri stand on a very different footing.

In the first place there is a group of lines which formally introduce speeches, after a verb implying speaking has already been employed.

Γ 318 f. λαοὶ δ' ἡρήσαντο, θεοῖσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον'  
ὥδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε

319 om. P. Berl. 263.

Γ 386 ff. γρηὶ δέ μιν εἰκνία παλαιγενεὶ προσέειπεν  
εἰροκόμῳ, ἥ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνι ναιετάωσῃ  
ἦσκειν εἴρια καλά, μάλιστα δέ μιν φιλέεσκε'  
τῇ μιν ἔεισαμένη προσεφώνεε δι' Ἀφροδίτῃ.

389. om. P. Tebt. 427.

<sup>1</sup> There is also a meagre possibility that Ox. Pap. 949 had a different version of K 446.

Similar examples are Δ 369, Ox. Pap. 753; N 46, 480, P. Brit. Mus. 732; P 219, P. Berl. 230; P 326, P. Berl. 9783. Haplography could be invoked only in the cases of Δ 369 (*καὶ . . . , καὶ . . .*), and N 46 (*αἶψα . . . , Αἶαντε . . .*), where it may serve to explain the omission of these lines by the first hands of A and F<sup>z</sup> respectively. With these exceptions P 219, omitted by S<sup>1</sup>NJTY<sup>b</sup>LEY<sup>c</sup> (Eust.) added in margin S<sup>2</sup>P and marked with a sign ' in A, is the only line for which our MSS show any disturbance; N 46 being found even in a Paris papyrus. There is however a scholium on N 480 *ἐν πολλοῖς οὐ φέρεται*. The group which forms almost one-fifth of the whole number of intentionally omitted lines cannot possibly be the result of accident. That is the writers of these papyri did not independently prune the vulgate text in the same fashion. The contrast with the other intentionally omitted lines is also marked by the fact that the latter are regularly omitted by a considerable portion of the MSS, while the omission of these lines finds quite as regularly no reflection in the manuscripts. It seems to me that there are three hypotheses between which we must choose: 1) Our MSS have a common archetype later than the vulgate edition of 150 B. C. in which these interpolations were made; 2) Our MSS reproduce faithfully this vulgate, while these papyri represent a critically revised vulgate edition; 3) The lines were absent from the first vulgate edition, they were soon interpolated in some MSS, and have spread until by the time our MSS begin they had become universal. Of these hypotheses the last seems to me the most probable. In its support I may note that Γ 389 is omitted by the Ptolemaic papyrus Hibeh 20; this being the only one of the lines covered by a Ptolemaic fragment. Furthermore there seems to be no proof that any of these lines was read by Aristarchus. Now quite on a par with this group is the passage:

Φ 71 ff. αὐτὰρ ὁ τῇ ἐτέρῃ μὲν ἐλὼν ἐλλίσσεται γούνων,  
τῇ δ' ἐτέρῃ ἔχεν ἔγχος ἀκαχμένον οὐδὲ μεθείει·  
καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.

The note of Didymus to the last line is: *τοῦτον προστιθέασιν, οὐ φερόμενον ἐν ταῖς Ἀριστάρχου*. What Didymus tells us of this line is, I believe, true of the whole group of similar lines.

The remaining cases of omitted lines present four characteristics in common: 1) With a single exception these lines can always be dispensed with, generally to the improvement of the text; 2) These lines are omitted by *all* the papyri covering the passage; 3) These lines (except the doubtful case of Ψ 626) are omitted by a considerable portion of the MSS, especially by the older ones; 4) None of the lines can be proved to be Aristarchean, while some are known to have been absent from his text. From these facts the conclusion must be drawn that these lines were originally foreign to the vulgate and to the edition of Aristarchus. They were interpolated in some MSS and spread owing to the tendency of the tradition (cf. Allen, loc. cit.) to assimilate in its later stages. Frequently we can see this taking place as the lines are added in the margins of MSS in which they were lacking.

The examples are:<sup>1</sup>

A 265. Θησέα τ' Αιγείδην, ἐπείκελον ἀθανάτοισι.

Omitted by P. Rylands 43, and Ox. Pap. 537. The line is omitted by ASBMD<sup>r</sup>GJD<sup>d</sup>LH<sup>b</sup>EW<sup>b</sup>XX<sup>c</sup>Z, by the first hand of D<sup>c</sup>HTWY<sup>b</sup>Q<sup>b</sup>E<sup>s</sup>U<sup>a</sup>X<sup>b</sup> in which it is added by a second hand. It is = Hes. sc. 182 and is quoted as Homeric by Dio Chrys.<sup>2</sup> 57. 1, Paus. 10. 29. 10, and is read by FP<sup>v</sup>E<sup>c</sup>P<sup>d</sup>U<sup>c</sup>YY<sup>c</sup>Z<sup>v</sup>. There is no proof (cf. Ludwig, AHT. II. 397 n.) that the line was Aristarchean. It is omitted by Ludwig. The line is accepted without hesitation by Scott, Athenian Interpolations, Class. Phil. VI, p. 426; Shewan, The Lay of Dolon, p. 160 n., rejoices over its defence by Friedländer, Herakles, Phil. Unt. XIX, pp. 166–76, which is far from being such a 'defence'<sup>3</sup> as Shewan should want. Mr. Lang is wiser, cf. The World of Homer, p. 16 n. and the index s. v. Theseus.

B 166 ff. ὥς ἔφατ'· οὐδ' ἀπίθησε θεά, γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη,  
βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων ἀίεσσα.  
καρπαλίμως δ' ἔκανε θοάς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.  
εὗρεν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα κτέ.

<sup>1</sup> I cite the readings of the MSS from Ludwig's commentary, to which I am also indebted for the readings of three papyri, P. Brit. Mus. 107, 114, cod. Bodl. MS Gr. Class. a. 1 (P).

<sup>2</sup> Dio's comments contain, however, no allusion to Theseus.

<sup>3</sup> Friedlaender's idea, which goes back to Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Hom. Unt., p. 260, n. 23, is that Theseus is originally not Athenian but Thessalian.

Verse 168 (= B 17) is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 126 and probably by the Bodleian papyrus. It is omitted also by ABMGJQ<sup>b</sup>E and by the first hands of SD<sup>b</sup>TU<sup>b</sup>N<sup>a</sup>E<sup>s</sup>U<sup>a</sup>X<sup>b</sup>X<sup>c</sup> in which it is added by a second or third hand; it is found in D<sup>c</sup>FF<sup>r</sup>HY<sup>b</sup>H<sup>b</sup>PX. There is no evidence that the verse was Aristarchean. It is omitted by Ludwich, and one should compare his note AHT. II. 479.

B 204 ff.

εἰς κοῖρανός ἔστω,  
εἰς βασιλεύς, ᾧ δῶκε Κρόνον πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω  
σκηπτρόν τ' ἡδὲ θέμιστας, ἵνα σφίσι βασιλεύῃ.

The last verse (Ω I 99) is omitted by P. Tebt. 4, P. Brit. Mus. 126, and probably by the Bodleian papyrus. It is omitted also by ASBMD<sup>b</sup>DGHTLN<sup>a</sup>QX<sup>b</sup>X<sup>c</sup>ZZ<sup>p</sup> and by the first hands of D<sup>b</sup>JP<sup>x</sup>E<sup>s</sup>CED<sup>c</sup>FF<sup>r</sup>JU<sup>b</sup>Y<sup>b</sup>PU<sup>a</sup>XY<sup>1</sup> in which it is added by the second hands. It is quoted by Dio Chrys. I. 11 with the variant *βουλεύησιν* which is closer to I 99, and is found in D<sup>c</sup>FF<sup>r</sup>WU<sup>b</sup>Y<sup>b</sup>H<sup>b</sup>PC<sup>b</sup>E<sup>c</sup>UU<sup>a</sup>U<sup>c</sup>XY.<sup>1</sup> Two MSS C<sup>b</sup>E designate it as *στίχος νόθος*. Eustathius did not know it (cf. 203, 18). There is no evidence that the line was Aristarchean; it is omitted by Ludwich.

B 557 f. Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας.

στῆσε δ' ἄγων ἔν' Ἀθηναίων ἵσταντο φάλαγγες

The second verse is omitted by P. Tebt. 265 and the Bodleian papyrus. It is also omitted by ADF<sup>r</sup>GU<sup>b</sup>E<sup>s</sup>Y and by the first hands of D<sup>c</sup>FHKY<sup>b</sup>F<sup>b</sup>C in which it is added by the second hands; it occurs in BMF<sup>c</sup>JF<sup>b</sup>F<sup>d</sup>F<sup>b</sup>H<sup>b</sup>PF<sup>z</sup>U<sup>a</sup>U<sup>c</sup>X. It is cited by Aristot. rhet. I 1375<sup>b</sup>, 28, while the story of its interpolation by Solon or Peisistratos is given by Strabo IX 394, Plut. Sol. 10; Diog. La. I. 48. Quintilian 5. 11. 40 says that it was not found in all editions; and Aristonicus, at Γ 230, says: *παραιτητέον ἐκείνον τὸν στίχον τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον*. The verse has long been a battle ground of the critics; for my present purpose it is sufficient to point out that it was not in the edition of Aristarchus nor in the vulgate edition, a conclusion which is in agreement with Ludwich, AHT. II. 395 ff. Ludwich prints the line in small type. It would be well therefore to prove that the poet wrote the verse before asserting with Scott, op. cit., p. 424 "that he had the same

<sup>1</sup> There seems to be confusion in these statements of Ludwich's.

idea when he pictured the Epipoleis, the Teichomachia, and the fighting between Hector and Ajax at the ships".

Δ 193 ff. Ταλθύβι', ὅττι τάχιστα Μαχάονα δεῦρο κάλεσσον  
φῶτ' Ἀσκληπιοῦ υἱόν, ἀμύμονος ἱγῆρος,  
ὅφρα ἴδῃ Μενέλαον Ἀρήιον, Ἀτρεΐος υἱόν,  
ὃν τις διστεύσας ἔβαλεν, τόξων ἐν εἰδώς,  
Τρώων ἢ Λυκίων, τῷ μὲν κλέος, ἅμμι δὲ πένθος.

The last two lines (= Δ 206-7) are omitted by Ox. Pap. 544, and by the Cairo papyrus.<sup>1</sup> They are also omitted by SY<sup>b</sup>, and the first hands of DN<sup>a</sup>; J omits line 197. The Venetus has the following note of Aristonicus to v. 195: ὁ ἀστερίσκος καὶ ὁ ὀβελός, ὅτι νῦν παρέλκει. This was rewritten by Friedländer in the plural so as to refer to 195-7, it being evident that 195 alone cannot be dropped. Ludwig, AHT. I. 246 apparently, and Roemer, Aristarchs Athetesen, p. 272 explicitly approve this change. This in spite of the fact that the scholia BT have also the singular (referred to the wrong verse) οὐ περιττὸς οὖν ὁ στίχος τὸ "ὃν τις διστεύσας" μιμούμενος τὸ ἦθος τῶν τεταραγμένων,<sup>2</sup> which Roemer again rewrites. The evidence I am presenting points to a much simpler conclusion; vv. 196-7 were not in the edition of Aristarchus. Ludwig prints 195-7 in small type.

E 40 ff. πρώτῳ γὰρ στρεφθέντι μεταφρένῳ ἐν δόρῳ πῆξεν  
ῥῶμων μεσσηγύς, διὰ δὲ στήθεσφιν ἔλασσε.  
δοῦπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

The last verse (= Δ 504) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 223, and also by ABM and the first hands of TEX<sup>b</sup> in which it is added by the second hands. It is found in the rest of Ludwig's MSS. There is no evidence that it is Aristarchean. Ludwig prints it in small type. Drerup, p. 97 n., regards it as possibly interpolated.

E 56 ff. μεταφρενον οὐτασε δουρὶ  
ῥῶμων μεσσηγύς, διὰ δὲ στήθεσφιν ἔλασσεν.  
ἤριπε δὲ πρηγής, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Verse 57 (= E 41) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 223, and also by BLX<sup>b</sup> and the first hands of ASMT(K?)N<sup>b</sup> in which it is

<sup>1</sup> Fortune has dealt unkindly with us, inasmuch as P. Aberd. 3 begins with Δ 199, while Δ 193-7 are missing from P. Brit. Mus. 136.

<sup>2</sup> Such is the form quoted by Roemer; according to Dindorf the reference to 195 is correct in B,

added by the second hands. It stands in the rest of Ludwich's MSS. There is no evidence that it was Aristarchean. Ludwich prints it in small type, and Drerup, p. 97, concedes the possibility of its omission.

Θ 5 f. *κέκλυτέ μευ, πάντες τε θεοὶ πᾶσαι τε θέαιναι*  
*ὄφρ' εἶπω, τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.*

The second formulaic verse is omitted by P. Goodspeed 7, and by AP<sup>x</sup> and the first hand of S; it is added by the third hand of S, and is found in BM and the rest of Ludwich's MSS. There is no proof that it was in the edition of Aristarchus. Ludwich prints it in small type.

N 255 ff. *Ἴδομενεῦ, Κρητῶν βουληφόρε χαλκοχιτώνων.*  
*ἔρχομαι, εἴ τί τοι ἔγχος ἐνὶ κλισίῃσι λείλειπται,*  
*οἰσόμενος.*

The first line is omitted in P. Brit. Mus. 732, and P. Berl. 46, it is also omitted by ΣAB and the first hands of SMTK; it is added by the second or third hands of these MSS, and is found in D<sup>b</sup>DHJD<sup>d</sup>Y<sup>b</sup>H<sup>b</sup>PF<sup>z</sup>XYZZ<sup>p</sup>P<sup>c</sup>. S<sup>3</sup> adds it also (266<sup>a</sup>) at the beginning of the next speech of Meriones, and Eustathius has it in the latter but not in the former place. A scholium in T to 254 reads: *ἐν τισι μετὰ τοῦτον φέρεται Ἴδομενεῦ κτλ.* Ludwich comments, AHT. I. 353: "Rührt das Scholion aus den Kreisen der Aristarcheer her, so muss der Vers u. A. in Aristarchs Text gefehlt haben: s. Einl., § 42". There is now no reason to doubt this fact, and the source of the note may well be Didymus. Ludwich omits the line.

N 315 f. *οἷ μιν ἄδην ἐλώσσι καὶ ἐσσύμενον πολέμοιο,*  
*Ἐκτορα Πριαμίδην, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερὸς ἐστιν.*

The second verse is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 732 and Ox. Pap. 769 (P. Berl. 46 unfortunately is not available for this line), and also by ABM and the first hands of ST; it is added by S<sup>3</sup>T<sup>2</sup> and stands in D<sup>b</sup>DHJD<sup>d</sup>KU<sup>b</sup>Y<sup>b</sup>LH<sup>b</sup>PF<sup>z</sup>XYZZ<sup>p</sup>. Eustathius seems the earliest authority for the line, which is printed by Ludwich in small type.

Ξ 267 ff. *ἀλλ' ἴθ', ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι Χαρίτων μίαν ὀπλοτεράων*  
*δώσω ὀπνιέμεναι καὶ σὴν κεκληῆσθαι ἄκοιτιν*  
*Πασιθέην, ἥς αἰὲν ἱμείρειαι ἥματα πάντα.*

The last line (υ 276) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 551; P. Brit. Mus. 732; it is also omitted by ΣABDGTKY<sup>b</sup>LH<sup>b</sup>Q<sup>b</sup>E<sup>b</sup>F<sup>z</sup>U



and by the first hands of SM. It is added by S<sup>3</sup>M<sup>2</sup> and is found in D<sup>b</sup>HJU<sup>b</sup>PCE<sup>c</sup>U<sup>d</sup>XYZ. It is not even certain that Eustathius had the verse. Contrast the unanimity with which 276 is presented to us. Ludwich omits the verse. Scholiast B at 276 declares that Hera intentionally avoided (269) specifying the name of the Charis to be given to Hypnos.

Ξ 419 f. *χειρὸς δ' ἔκβαλεν ἔγχος, ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ἀσπίς ἐάφθη  
καὶ κόρυς, ἀμφὶ δὲ οἱ βράχε τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ.*

The second line is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 732 and also by © and the first hand of A. It is added by A<sup>2</sup> and stands in the rest of Ludwich's MSS. Eustathius had the line but there is no evidence to connect it with Aristarchus. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ο 480 f. *κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὐτυκτον ἔθηκεν  
ἵππουριν· δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν.*

The second line (= Γ 337 etc.) is omitted by P. Berl. 230, also by AD<sup>b</sup>NGHJTY<sup>b</sup>LH<sup>b</sup>PE<sup>b</sup>C<sup>b</sup>FzObQ<sup>d</sup>RU<sup>d</sup>YZZ<sup>p</sup> and by E<sup>c</sup> together with the two preceding lines. It is found in SBMU<sup>b</sup>X. There is no evidence to connect it with Aristarchus. Ludwich omits the line.

Ο 561 ff. *ὦ φίλοι, ἀνέρες ἔστε καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ  
ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεῖσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὕσμινας.  
αἰδομένων ἀνδρῶν πλέονες σοοὶ ἢ ἐπέφανται.*

The second line is omitted by P. Berl. 230, and also by NTPUYZ and the first hands of SU<sup>b</sup>C; it is added by S<sup>3</sup>U<sup>b2</sup>C<sup>2</sup> and stands in the rest of Ludwich's MSS including A and Z<sup>p</sup>. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the verse. Ludwich does not discriminate against it.

Π 611 ff. *τὸ δ' ἐξόπιθεν δόρυ μακρὸν  
οὔδεις ἐνισκίμφθη, ἐπὶ δ' οὐρίαχος πελεμίσθη  
ἔγχος· ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτ' ἀφίει μένος ὄβριμος Ἄρης.  
αἰχμὴ δ' Αἰνείας κραδαιομένη κατὰ γαίης  
ῥέετ', ἐπεὶ β' ἄλιον στιβαρῆς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὄρουσεν.*

The last two verses (=N 504 f.) are omitted in P. Greco-Egizii II. 110, and also by ABMNGTU<sup>b</sup>LH<sup>b</sup>PE<sup>b</sup>FzUU<sup>d</sup>ZZ<sup>p</sup>, and the first hands of SHY<sup>b</sup>. They are added by S<sup>3</sup>H<sup>2</sup>Y<sup>b2</sup>, and are found in JE<sup>c</sup>XY<sup>c</sup>Y<sup>c</sup>. Not even Eustathius knows the lines, which are omitted by Ludwich. There is a scholium of

Didymus to v. 613: ἐν τῇ ἐτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου οὐκ ἐφέρετο καθάπαξ· ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ ὁβελὸς αὐτῷ παρέκειτο, which is perfectly credible. It recalls Δ 195 ff.

Σ 198 ff. ἀλλ' αὐτως ἐπὶ τάφρον ἰὼν Τρώεσσι φάνηθι  
αἱ κέ σ' ὑποδείσαντες ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο  
Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσῃσι δ' Ἀρήιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν  
τειρόμενοι· ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο.

The last two verses (= Δ 800 ff., Π 42 ff.) are omitted by the Harris papyrus (P. Brit. Mus. 107) and probably by P. Brit. Mus. 127. The reason for the last statement is that the papyrus has ε in the margin opposite line 505, while before line 100  $\bar{a}$  is correctly placed. Ordinarily such stichometric marks are not entitled to much credence, but in the present case we find in the Harris papyrus exactly 5 of these intentionally omitted lines (200-1, 381, 427, 441) each of which stood in a portion of pap. 127 that is now lost. In view of the regularity with which the papyri agree in this respect it is probable that the numbering in pap. 127 is correct and the lines (which differ from those suggested by Kenyon, p. 98) were actually missing. The lines here are omitted also by ΣNJ, but are found in A and most of Ludwich's MSS. That the omission—which might easily be ascribed to haplography—is really intentional, and that the lines are late intruders is shown by the fact that they come in singly; line 201 being omitted also by SD<sup>b</sup>TCE<sup>c</sup>Q<sup>d</sup>RZZ<sup>p</sup> and the first hand of Y. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the lines, or at least the first one. Ludwich prints them in small type.

Σ 426 f. αὔδα, ὃ τι φρονέεις· τελέσαι δέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν  
εἰ δύναιμαι τελέσαι γε καὶ εἰ τετελεσμένον ἐστί.

The second line is omitted by the Harris papyrus and probably by P. Brit. Mus. 127; also by ΣG and the first hand of H. It is added by H<sup>2</sup> and is found in A and the bulk of Ludwich's manuscripts. There is no evidence to connect it with any ancient authority; the intramarginal scholium ἄνωγεν] ἐν ἄλλῳ ἀνῶγει being of doubtful provenance.

Σ 440 f. τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὖτις  
οἴκαδε ροστήσαντα, δόμον Πηλῆιον εἴσω.

The second line is omitted by the Harris Papyrus and pre-

sumably by P. Brit. Mus. 127. G is the only MS to omit it, but we have a scholium: ἔν τισιν οὐ κεῖται At, the age and source of which is doubtful. Ludwich prints the line in ordinary type.

Σ 604 f. *τερπόμενοι* [μετὰ δὲ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος αἰοῖδς  
φορμίζων] *δοιῶ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς.*

The bracketed words are not found in the Harris papyrus nor in P. Brit. Mus. 127 nor in any manuscript. They were introduced into the text by Wolf from Athen. 181<sup>d</sup> who says that they were cut out by Aristarchus. The question is discussed by Ludwich, AHT. I, 439, who declares "ein besserer Bericht-erstatte würde gesagt haben: athetirte". The last assertion is undoubtedly wrong, Athenaeus meant that the words were not in the text of Aristarchus; their absence from the papyri and the manuscript, shows that they were not in the vulgate. The further question of whether they were in earlier texts or not, and, if so, of Aristarchus' reasons for rejecting them, do not concern us at present. The words are omitted by Ludwich.

Χ 120 *μή τι κατακρύψειν, ἀλλ' ἄνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι*  
*κτῆσιν, ὅσων πτολίεθρον ἐπήρατον ἐντὸς ἑέργει.*

The last verse (Σ 512) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 558, and also by ASHZ<sup>p</sup>. It is found in BMNJU<sup>b</sup>YLH<sup>b</sup>PXYZ. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the verse; Ludwich omits it.

Ψ 564 f. *ὁ δ' ᾤχετο καὶ οἱ ἔνεικεν.*  
*Εὐμήλω δ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει· ὁ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων,*

The second verse is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128; and also by ΣABMHTPU and in the text of U<sup>b</sup>YZ<sup>p</sup>. It is added in the margin of these three MSS, and stands in SNGJY<sup>b</sup>H<sup>b</sup>Q<sup>b</sup>X Y<sup>c</sup>Z. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the line, which Ludwich omits.

Ψ 626 f. *ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα, τέκος, κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες*  
*οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμπεδα γυνία, φίλος, πόδες, κτλ.*

The first line is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128, but added at the top of the column. This looks like a pure accident and the line is not omitted by any manuscript. On the other hand is the fact that according to Aristonicus the line was not in the edition of Aristarchus. It is possible that it was an exceed-

ingly early and successful intruder. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ψ 802 ff. ἄνδρε δὺν περὶ τῶνδε κελεύομεν, ὦ περ ἀρίστω,  
τεύχεα ἔσσαμένω, ταμεσίχροα χαλκὸν ἐλόντε,  
ἀλλήλων προπάρειθεν ὀμίλου πειρηθῆναι.

The last verse is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128, and also by SP<sup>x</sup>UU<sup>d</sup> and the first hands of AGT. It is added in the margin of these MSS by the second hands, and stands in the bulk of Ludwich's MSS, BMN included. The line, however, cf. AHT. 1, 403, was unknown to the Alexandrian critics; Eustathius passes over it in his commentary. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ψ 862 ff. αὐτίκα δ' ἰὼν  
ἦκεν ἐπικρατέως, οὐ δ' ἠπέλησεν ἀνακτι  
ἀρνῶν πρωτογόνων ῥέξειν κλειτὴν ἑκατόμβην.

The last verse (= 873, Δ 102) is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128, and also by ΞSNT (note also that B<sup>2</sup> seems to have used a MS in which this verse was lacking, cf. Ludwich at 866). The verse stands in the bulk of the MSS including A; the oldest authority for it is Eustathius. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ω 555 ff. σὺ δὲ δέξαι ἄποινα  
πολλά, τά τοι φέρομεν· σὺ δὲ τῶνδ' ἀπόναιο, καὶ ἔλθοις  
σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, ἐπεὶ με πρῶτον ἔασας  
αὐτόν τε ζῶειν καὶ ὄρᾱν φάος ἡέλλιοιο.

The last verse is omitted by the Bankes Papyrus (P. Brit. Mus. 114), but added in the margin by a second hand. It is also omitted by STP<sup>x</sup>Y<sup>b</sup>LU<sup>d</sup>Z<sup>p</sup>, and by the first hand of G. It is added by the second hand of G, and stands in A (with the gloss A<sup>r</sup>: οὗτος ὁ στίχος οὐχ εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ) BM and the bulk of Ludwich's manuscripts. The verse was not even known to Eustathius, who, like Didymus, puzzles over the meaning of ἔασας. Ludwich omits the line. It is unfortunate that we are deprived of the testimony of P. Brit. Mus. 128 at this point.

Ω 692 f. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἶξον ἐνρρεῖος ποταμοῖο  
Ξάνθου δινῆεντος, δν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς.

The second line (=Ξ 434, Φ 2) is omitted by the Bankes Papyrus and P. Brit. Mus. 128; also by ASNGJTE<sup>b</sup> and the

first hand of Y. It is added in the margin of Y by a second hand, and stands in BMD<sup>c</sup>HY<sup>b</sup>H<sup>b</sup>PXZZ<sup>p</sup>. Eustathius does not comment on ll. 688–696, and our line has no older authority. It is omitted by Ludwich.

Ω 789 ff. τῆμος ἄρ' ἀμφὶ πυρὴν κλυτοῦ Ἑκτορος ἔγρετο λαός.  
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ β' ἤγερθεν ὀμηγερέες τε γέγοντο,  
πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ πυρκαϊὴν σβέσαν κτλ.

The second of these lines is omitted by the Bankes papyrus (P. Brit. Mus. 128 stops before this) and also by AD<sup>c</sup>TY<sup>b</sup>LH<sup>b</sup>UU<sup>d</sup>YZZ<sup>p</sup>. It is found in SBMNHJU<sup>b</sup>E<sup>x</sup>PE<sup>b</sup>XY<sup>c</sup>. Eustathius' commentary passes from *θρασύν* (786) to *λάρνακα* (795). The line is omitted by Ludwich.

If one looks back over this list of 27 passages, he must be impressed by the solidarity of the papyrus testimony. It wavers only at two points, the addition of Ψ 626 and Ω 558 by second hands, the date of which is not stated. This points to an intrusion, though an early one of these lines, as they may well come from some source other than the MS from which the papyrus was copied. The majuscule MSS (for Θ, cf. Ξ 420; for Σ, N 255, Ξ 269, Σ 200–1, 427, Ψ 565, 864) whenever cited by Ludwich are in agreement with the papyri. The oldest minuscule MS A is opposed to the papyri eight times,<sup>1</sup> but twice (Σ 441, Ω 558) with glosses that confirm their testimony; while in three other cases (Σ 200–1, 427, Ψ 864) it thus puts itself also into opposition with the Syrian palimpsest. This united testimony is too strong to be disregarded; and, if we ever get a recension of the vulgate as it existed about 150 B. C. these lines must disappear.

My belief that all these lines are non-Aristarchean may appear more doubtful. But we have found 36 cases of lines accidentally omitted for seven (B 532, P 160–2, 173, Σ 141–2, 360, 537, Ω 344) of which we can prove more or less positively their presence in the edition of Aristarchus. Even if we set aside the four doubtful cases, the figures (32–5) will not be seriously altered. This shows what might be expected from a random selection of thirty-odd lines. The 27 passages

<sup>1</sup> Δ 196–7, O 562, Σ 200–1, 427, 441, Ψ 626, 864, Ω 558; not counting of course E 57, Ξ 420, Ψ 804, where the line is added by the second hand. Is it significant that the opposition in Σ is practically complete?

just discussed, and the 7 introductions of speeches, make 34 intentionally omitted lines. For not one is there the slightest indication that it was by Aristarchus;<sup>1</sup> while on the contrary, there are 5 passages B 558. Δ 196-7. N 255. Σ 604/5. Ψ 626 for which there is positive proof that they are non-Aristarchean, besides others in which the silence of the scholia and even Eustathius is eloquent.

These facts have their bearing also on the treatment of Homeric papyri. It has been the custom, when it could be proved that a papyrus lacked a certain number of verses between certain points, to suppose that these were most likely verses athetised by Aristarchus. For instance Kenyon, *Class. Texts*, p. 100 after noting the numerals opposite Ψ 502, 604, 705, 805, says: "The two (lines) missing before l. 502 were probably either ll. 92 and 701 (l. 471) or ll. 405, 6 all of which were athetised by Aristarchus; l. 565 was certainly omitted, but no other has dropped out between ll. 502 and 604, so the numeration is either wrong or else is taken from a MS which omitted also l. 581 (athetised by Aristarchus)". The inadmissibility of such inferences is now clear. Verses athetised by Aristarchus will appear—barring haplography and similar accidents—regularly in our papyri. The verses to suspect are those known to have been absent from his edition, or those which may not have been in his edition and are absent from other papyri or our manuscripts.

There remains one exceptional passage.

Σ 380 ff. ὁφρ' ὃ γε ταῦτ' ἐπονείτο ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσσι,  
τόφρα οἱ ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε θεά, Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα.  
τῇν δὲ ἶδε κτέ.

The second line is omitted by the Harris papyrus (and its omission perhaps implied by the numeration of P. Brit. Mus. 127). That this is not an accident is shown by the omission of the line in NGY<sup>p</sup> and the first hands of ASU<sup>b</sup>; it is added by the second hands of these three MSS (with a gloss: ἐν ἄλλῳ καὶ οὗτος εὐρέθη, ἀπέστραπτο δέ Α<sup>r</sup>), and is found in the rest of Ludwig's MSS. Nevertheless the line is absolutely neces-

<sup>1</sup> Unless it be sch. Σ 441 ἐν τισιν οὐ κεῖται Α<sup>t</sup>; which, however, may be not ancient, but on a line with sch. Ω 558 οὗτος ὁ στίχος οὐχ εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ Α<sup>r</sup>. Ludwig ascribes both hesitatingly to Didymus.

sary.<sup>1</sup> The most probable hypothesis seems to me that we have a case of haplography in a common ancestor of these MSS, and that brings us very close to a single archetype.<sup>2</sup>

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*            \*

The above was sent to the printer before I came upon the article, *Ilias*papyrus P. Morgan, by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and G. Plaumann in the Sitz. Ber. d. kgl. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1912, pp. 1198-1219. The account of this remarkable volume—part (A-II) of a cheap edition of the *Iliad* published about 300 A. D.—gives an excellent opportunity for testing the opinions I have advanced, and I think confirms them. Lines, the omission of which I have classed as accidental (N 67. 602-6. O 444. 551), all occur in the Morgan papyrus. The superfluous formulae for the introduction of speeches (N 46. 480) are not omitted; but I have already indicated that these were to be considered extremely early interpolations. Of six lines which I regarded as absent from the archetype, five (N 255. 316. Ξ 269. 420. O 481) are omitted also by this papyrus. The remaining line, O 562, is misplaced (standing after 530), which shows that it was not in the text, but in the margin of the manuscript from which this book was copied. The case is therefore parallel to those of Ψ 626. Ω 558.

My forecast—cf. above—of the sort of line that would not appear in a papyrus is also confirmed by the absence of the following lines. A 543 *Ζεὺς γάρ οἱ νεμεσᾶθ', ὅτ' ἀμείνονι φωτὶ μάχοιτο*,—brought into our printed texts from Aristot. rhet. II 9, p. 1387<sup>a</sup> 35, Plut. de poet. aud. 24<sup>c</sup>, 36<sup>a</sup>, and foreign to all our manuscript tradition. The line is omitted by Ludwich and consequently by Ox. Pap. 550. N 731<sup>3</sup> *ἄλλω δ' ὀρχηστὴν, ἐτέρω κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδὴν*—the verse was read by Zenodotus (cf. schol. T. and Eust. 957. 10) but was ignored by Aristarchus and Aristonicus (at A 420), it is omitted by AS<sup>1</sup>BMH<sup>1</sup>TP<sup>1</sup>U<sup>d</sup>ZZ<sup>p</sup>, it

<sup>1</sup> That is if l. 380 is to stand. Scholia to both 380-1 are lacking and Eustathius does not comment on them.

<sup>2</sup> As an indication of a single archetype might be considered also the absence in all MSS of Θ 216<sup>a</sup>, which seems to me rather a defect.

<sup>3</sup> This and the two following fall within the great gap N 675-Ξ 120 of pap. 732 of the British Museum.

is added with ἐν ἄλλῳ A<sup>r</sup> and in margin S<sup>3</sup>H<sup>2</sup>P<sup>2</sup>, and stands in DbDJD<sup>d</sup>KP<sup>x</sup>UbY<sup>b</sup>LCC<sup>b</sup>E<sup>c</sup>F<sup>z</sup>O<sup>b</sup>UXYY<sup>c</sup>. N 749 αὐτίκα δ' ἐξ ὀχέων σὸν τεύχεσιν ἄλτο χαμᾶζε omitted by A<sup>1</sup>H<sup>1</sup>U<sup>d</sup>, is added in margin by A<sup>2</sup>H<sup>2</sup> and stands in the text of the other manuscripts including SBM. There is no proof that it was known to Aristarchus, or even to Eustathius. Ludwig prints it in small type. Ξ 70 ῥωνύμους ἀπολέσθαι ἀπ' Ἀργεος ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιοὺς (= M 70), omitted by Ludwig, following A<sup>1</sup>SBM<sup>1</sup>DKU<sup>b1</sup>Y<sup>b1</sup>H<sup>b</sup>Y<sup>c</sup>; it is added in the margin by A<sup>1</sup>M<sup>2</sup>U<sup>b2</sup>Y<sup>b2</sup>, and stands in the text of DbGHJTPXYZ. It is omitted by Eustathius, and there is no evidence to connect it with Aristarchus.

The other omissions are clearly on a different footing; they vary from book to book in such a fashion that they should be ascribed not to the writer but to his sources. In A lines 195-209. 265-8. 313. 331. 369. 503. 535. 560. 595. 735 are omitted, but supplied (except 195-209) by a second hand. This is pure carelessness: that the omission of 313 (due to passing from one column to another) was not intended is guaranteed by 316<sup>a</sup>; no one would advocate dropping 503 or 595, while the omission of the others cannot even be considered. In M the omissions, 51. 378. 404. 418-9 (haplography as also in Q<sup>1</sup>). 426-8. 431. 439. 448-50. 458, are of the same character; but the corrector has stopped adding lines. Only the omission of 458 could be considered, and that has nothing to recommend it. In N such omissions, 178. 230. 241. 347. 501. 596-7 are rarer; only the last could be considered, and it is obviously due to haplography. Carelessness in the transposition and repetition of lines (cf. notes to 14. 382. 439. 705. 794) is manifest only in II and this book. In Ξ the omissions are still fewer, 12. 182-3. 229. 401; and, what is more remarkable, every one is possible, though not desirable. That line 12 is omitted by P<sup>x</sup> might be considered a mere coincidence, but cf. below on O 578 and II 154. Otherwise the omissions receive no support from our manuscripts; while, on the contrary, we have papyrus and majuscule testimony in behalf of the other lines, and for 229 a reading of Aristarchus. It looks then as if this text went back to a critically revised edition of the vulgate, in support of which may be noted the presence of plus verses in the other books. In O but three lines are missing; 68 which could possibly be spared, 454. 704 which



are indispensable. The manuscript now shows a new characteristic; verses added in the source at the head or foot of a column are copied in their new order, regardless of the nonsense that results. Thus 113 stands after 94, 562 after 530, 578 after 570; a greater but clearly mechanical dislocation is the placing of 650 after 452. Of these verses it is clear that 113 and 650 have been dropped accidentally; and we have already seen that line 562 was a plus verse from the point of view of the vulgate. For line 578 the case is doubtful; it is omitted by GHP<sup>x</sup>U<sup>b1</sup>U<sup>d</sup>, and there is no evidence that it is Aristarchean, but it is found in a papyrus (P. Berl. 230) of the fifth century. In II we are again confronted by pure carelessness. The omission of line 26 would be possible, though undesirable; while that of 154-5. 317 or 393 could not be considered. The dropping of lines 154-5 is due to haplography, but it is worth noting that in P<sup>x</sup> lines 153-4 are missing. Careless transpositions (between 41-44, 238-43) are also made.

Finally the papyrus is remarkable for the presence of plus verses in what is clearly a vulgate text. The examples are: A 316<sup>a</sup> διογενὲς Λαερτιάδῃ, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ (so also T<sup>2</sup>E<sup>c</sup>Y<sup>c</sup> K<sup>2</sup>), repeated also as 346<sup>a</sup>; Ξ 231<sup>a</sup> ἐρχομένῳ μετὰ φύλα βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν (so scholiast T, reading κατὰ); O 409<sup>ab</sup> = M 419-20.

My conclusions are thus quite different from those of Plau-mann, p. 1209, that of the plus and minus verses only A 543. N 749. Ξ 231<sup>a</sup>. 269 are important.

The papyri are like the sticks in the fable; their strength lies in their union.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.